

Supplemental Memorandum

To: STATE BOARD MEMBERS

Date: February 2003

From: Susan M. Bennett

Re: ITEM # 9

Subject For Information: Performance levels for non-test indicators in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM).

At its December meeting the State Board of Education (Board) reviewed as initial information a set of procedures for setting performance levels for the non-test indicator data reported by ASAM schools for school year 2001-2002. This item presents recommendations for proposed performance levels from the Superintendent's Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) as additional information.

Attachment I: Update: Performance Levels for Alternative Schools
Accountability Model Non-test Indicators (Pages 1-3)

**UPDATE: PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS
ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL NON-TEST INDICATORS**

Consistent with the charge from the Alternative Accountability Subcommittee to the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA), CDE's contractor, WestEd, convened an advisory panel to develop a set of proposed indicator performance levels. The panel included nationally recognized experts, California educators who have had experience with ASAM schools and indicators, and CDE staff. The panel proposed that performance levels for the indicators should be set based on the following information, as available:

- research regarding threshold levels on each indicator shown to affect student or school performance,
- practices in other states relative to setting performance levels for each indicator, and
- current ASAM performance distributions for each indicator.

The PSAA Alternative Accountability Subcommittee and full Advisory Committee have considered the information available and recommend a three-tiered approach with the following characteristics:

- At the top of the scale, an upper threshold can be determined for each indicator. A school that selects an indicator and performs at or above this level would be considered as meeting the standard for the indicator. The upper threshold would be subdivided into two categories provisionally called "*Commendable*" and "*Sufficient*" performance.
- Schools below this upper level would be expected to increase their performance on selected indicators at intervals such that the upper level could be reached within the 12-year period set by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This category provisionally would be called "*Growth Plan*."
- Schools that fail to meet a pre-set lower threshold would be identified as being at great risk and potentially subject to immediate action such as development of an improvement plan. This category would provisionally be called "*Immediate Intervention*."

The proposed performance levels have been set provisionally based on first-year data from ASAM schools. CDE will re-evaluate the levels and may propose adjustments to fine-tune them when data from school year 2002-2003 are available.

Proposed Alternative Schools Accountability Model Indicator Performance Levels¹

The Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) Advisory Committee has agreed to a system that sets challenging, yet defensible, growth targets on non-test indicators for schools on the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM). They recommend a three-tiered approach with the following characteristics:

- **Commendable and Sufficient:** At the top of the scale, an upper threshold can be determined for each indicator. A school that selects an indicator and performs at or above this level would be considered as meeting the standard for the indicator. The upper threshold would be subdivided into two categories indicating *sufficient* and *commendable* performance.
- **Growth Plan:** Schools below this upper level would be expected to increase their performance at intervals such that the upper level could be reached within the 12-year period set by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).
- **Immediate Intervention:** Schools that fail to meet a pre-set lower threshold would immediately be identified as being at great risk and potentially subject to immediate action such as development of an improvement plan.

These levels have been applied to the following indicators. The data are based on first-year results at ASAM schools for school year 2001-2002.

Indicator Name	Number of Schools Reporting	Commendable		Sufficient		Total Percent Sufficient or Above	Growth Plan		Immediate Intervention	Total Percent Below Sufficient
		Cut Score %	% of Schools Commendable	Cut Score %	% of Schools Sufficient but not Commendable		Cut Score %	% of Growth Plan Schools		
3. Student Punctuality	44	98	18%	84	39%	57%	64	29%	14%	43%
4. Sustained Daily Attendance	86	97	22%	87	37%	59%	66	28%	13%	41%
5. Student Persistence	31	NA*	NA*	97	65%	65%	86	32%	3%	35%
6. Attendance	572	95	8%	84	42%	50%	65	41%	9%	50%
11. Promotion to Next Grade	50	NA*	NA*	95	82%	82%	70	16%	2%	18%
12A. Course Completion	39	97	38%	92	23%	61%	65	36%	3%	39%
12B. Educational Program Completion	14	96	36%	90	14%	50%	80	36%	14%	50%
13A. Credit Completion	221	95	27%	84	29%	56%	65	32%	12%	44%
14A. High School Graduation	115	96	21%	75	23%	44%	35	40%	16%	56%
14B. On-time High School Graduation	91	95	13%	60	35%	48%	26	44%	8%	52%
15A. GED Completion	10	95	10%	70	30%	40%	30	30%	30%	60%
15C. GED Section Completion	8	95	0%	83	50%	50%	65	38%	12%	50%

*NA – Data distribution did not allow for commendable score range.

¹ Baseline data distributions for Indicators 1, 2, 12C, and 13B indicate that additional data will be required for school year 2002-2003 prior to setting performance levels.

JANUARY 24, 2002

**SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM # 9
ATTACHMENT I
Page 3 of 3**

An illustrative example, based on current ASAM data for Indicator 6: Attendance, is shown on page 2. *Sufficient* performance might be set at 84 percent with *commendable* performance set at 95 percent. Schools achieving the 84 percent level would be considered as meeting a reasonable standard. The lower limit, below which schools would be identified as needing *immediate intervention*, could be set at approximately 65 percent. Schools falling between 65 percent and 84 percent would be evaluated annually on their growth toward attaining the upper threshold.